

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on January 4, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 13, 17, 21, and 22 are amended, claims 2, 6, 12, 14-15, and 19-20 are canceled, no claims are added; as a result, claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13, 16-18, and 21-23 are now pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims do not introduce any new subject matter and are intended to cover claimable subject matter fully supported by the originally filed specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-8 and 13-23 were objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1-8 and 13-23 use the language "non-uniform resolutions per raster in a contiguous block of rasters". The Examiner states that "the specification does not describe non-uniform resolutions per raster". Applicant thanks the Examiner for the suggestion that the phrase "per raster" be omitted.

However, Applicant respectfully notes that the Application describes "non-uniform resolutions per raster in a contiguous block of rasters" on page 14, lines 17-18, as well as elsewhere in the specification as originally filed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objection is thus requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5-13, 15, 17-19, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Chikuma, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,729,710).

Applicant does not admit that the Chikuma reference is indeed prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the same at a later date. Nonetheless, in the interest of furthering prosecution in the present case the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, and 22 to include language indicated by the Examiner to contain allowable subject matter in connection with claim 2. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of the same. Applicant has canceled claims 2, 6, 12, 14-15, and 19-20 to obviate any potential redundancies.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the above 102 rejection for these claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom.

Claims 1, 4, 5-8 and 13-23 were rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Shioya, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,491,372).

For the reasons provided above the Applicant believes claims 1, 5, 13, 17, 21, and 22, as amended are allowable over Shioya. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Shioya 102 rejection for these claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base-claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this notice of allowable subject matter. Applicant has canceled claim 2 and incorporated the allowable subject matter into independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, and 22.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (360) 212-0769 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 10th day of March, 2005.

Sarah L. Reinhard
Name

Sarah L. Reinhard
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Matthew A. Shepherd, et al.

By their Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By:

Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date:

3/10/2005